

REMARKS

The present reply is responsive to the Office Action dated June 9, 2004. Claims 1, 3, 9 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Claims 8 and 16 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-7 and 9-15 are again presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

The Examiner objected to the title and the abstract. A new title has been provided. A new abstract is submitted herewith on a separate sheet. The Examiner also objected to claims 11-16 because of a duplication of the term "timer record operation setup means" in independent claim 11. The duplicate term in claim 11 has been deleted. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0172362 ("*Wonfor*") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0073927 ("*Knudson*"). The *Wonfor* reference discloses a pay-per-view delivery system with copy protection. The *Knudson* reference discloses an electronic program guide system that includes copy protection, and can display a message to a user if recording cannot be performed due to copy protection.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include "means for determining a registration state, wherein the timer record operation is set up only if the registration state of a selected one of the plurality of digital signal processing devices indicates that the selected device is registered with the digital broadcast receiving device." No new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at pages 18-23 of the specification, as well as FIGS. 6-9.

Neither *Wonfor* nor *Knudson* teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, registering a recording device with a digital broadcast receiver and performing a timer recording operation based upon a registration state. Therefore, because *Wonfor* and *Knudson* lack a disclosure or teaching of all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 9, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of these claims. Claims 2 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and contain all of the limitations thereof as well as other limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants submit that the dependent claims are likewise patentable.

Claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wonfor* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,799 ("*Marsh*"). *Marsh* is directed to an interactive cable television system having multiple VCRs for recording programming. User alert messages are displayed if, for example, there are changes in program schedules, time slot conflicts between multiple VCRs, or all VCRs are in use.

Independent claim 3 has been amended to recite "wherein said timer record operation execution controlling means detects registration states of said plurality of digital signal processing devices corresponding to data transmitted through the interface so as to determine whether or not the timer record operation can be executed." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at pages 18-23 of the specification and in FIGS. 6-9.

Neither *Wonfor* nor *Marsh* teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, detecting a registration state of a recording device and performing a timer recording operation based upon the registration state. Therefore, because *Wonfor* and *Marsh* lack a disclosure or teaching of all of the elements

of independent claim 3, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this claim. Claims 4-7 depend from claim 3 and contain all of the limitations thereof as well as other limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants submit that the dependent claims are likewise patentable.

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wonfor* and *Knudson* in view of *Marsh*. Independent claim 11 has been amended to include same additional limitation as independent claim 3. As discussed above, none of the references teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all of the limitations of amended claim 11. Therefore, because *Wonfor*, *Knudson* and *Marsh* are deficient, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 11. Claims 12-15 depend from claim 11 and contain all of the limitations thereof as well as other limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants submit that the dependent claims are likewise patentable.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew T. Zidel  
Registration No.: 45,256  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants